



PATENT APPLICATION
Docket No.: 15436.438.2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:)
Hoki Kwon)
Serial No: 10/078,474) Art Unit
Confirmation No.: 4860) 2828
Filed: February 21, 2002)
For: GAAS/AL(GA)AS DISTRIBUTED BRAGG)
REFLECTOR ON INP)
Examiner: Dung T. Nguyen)

CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSIT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that following documents are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Box: Mail Stop Issue Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 8th day of September, 2004.

- Transmittal of Issue Fee (2 pages) (in duplicate)
- PTO Form PTOL-85B transmitting payment of Issue Fee and Publication Fee
- Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance
- PTO-2038 Credit Card Payment Form for \$1,633.00
- Postcard

Respectfully submitted,

ERIC L. MASCHOFF
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,596
Customer No. 022913




R. PARRISH FREEMAN, JR.
PETER F. MALEN, JR.
L. REX SEARS, PH.D.
WILLIAM R. RICHTER
ERIC M. KAMERATH
ROBERT E. AYCOCK
JENS C. JENKINS
KEVIN W. STINGER
WILLIAM J. ATHAY
MICHAEL B. DODD
RYAN D. BENSON
SARA D. JONES
TIGE KELLER
JANNA L. JENSEN
MATTHEW D. TODD
J. LAVAR OLDHAM
MICHAEL J. FRODSHAM
JOSEPH L. KRUPA
BRETT A. HANSEN
BRETT I. JOHNSON
MATTHEW A. BARLOW
WESLEY C. ROSANDER
ANDREW S. HANSEN
CHAD E. NYDEGGER
JOSEPH G. PIA
CLINTON E. DUKE
DAVID J. LORENZ †

WORKMAN | NYDEGGER

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ATTORNEYS

1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84111
TELEPHONE: (801) 533-9800
FAX: (801) 328-1707
WEBSITE: [HTTP://WWW.WNLAW.COM](http://www.wnlaw.com)



PATENT APPLICATION

Docket No: 15436.438.2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Hoki Kwon

Serial No: 10/078,474

Confirmation No.: 4860

Filed: February 21, 2002

For: GAAS/AL(GA)AS DISTRIBUTED
BRAGG REFLECTOR ON INP

Examiner: Dung T. Nguyen

TRANSMITTAL OF ISSUE FEE PAYMENT

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due dated June 8, 2004, please find enclosed herewith the following items for filing in the United States Patent and Trademark Office in connection with the above identified patent application:

X Issue Fee Transmittal (PTOL-85B) submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.311.

X A Certificate of Deposit Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 is enclosed.

X Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance.

X PTO-2038 Credit Card Payment Form for \$1,633.00 is enclosed to cover:

X The \$1,330.00 government issue fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.18.

X The \$300.00 government publication fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.18.(d)

X The \$3.00 fee for one (1) copy of the patent when issued.

X The Commission is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-3178.

X A duplicate copy of this letter is enclosed.

Please address all future correspondence in connection with the above-identified patent application to the attention of the undersigned.

Dated this 8th day of September, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



ERIC L. MASCHOFF
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,596
Customer No. 022913



PATENT APPLICATION
Docket No: 15436.438.2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Hoki Kwon)
Serial No: 10/078,474) Art Unit
Filed: February 21, 2002) 2828
Confirmation No.: 4860)
For: GAAS/AL(GA)AS DISTRIBUTED BRAGG)
REFLECTOR ON INP)
Examiner: Dung T. Nguyen)

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE


Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in the communication mailed on June 8, 2004. The Applicant concurs with the Examiner's conclusion that the prior art does not suggest or render obvious the claimed invention. However, Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims in the above-identified application allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that distinguish the claim from the prior art and make it allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8 September 2004

By: 
ERIC L. MASCHOFF
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,596
Customer No. 022913